Fellowship

• • *January*, 1951 • Vol. XVII—No. 1 • 20 cents a copy—$2.00 a year

Foundations

Some invisible tower
stands under every star
from every soul on earth
who gazes up that far.

Traveling, steep and slow,
out from a mild regard
the tower invisible climbs
and stands there, silver-starred.

—WILLIAM STAFFORD

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

ff The New Year wouldn't seem like itself if it arrived without an article by A. J. Muste, and we present one here that is really close to being a meditation—about The Grand Inquisitor who joined the ranks of those who had "corrected" Christ's too-idealistic work and, from this more realistic point of view, did what he considered best for the people; while longing to follow Christ, he repudiates him as impractical. . . . A timely and important article by F. Siegmund-Schultze, Secretary of the IFOR, discusses the rapid spread of sentiment for the remilitarization of Germany and efforts to stem it. . . . Ferner Nuhn, well-known author of *The Wind Blew from the East* and other books, outlines some of the disciplines we must undertake if we are to attempt to rise to the challenge of "Apocalyptic Peacemaking" . . . and John Swomley tells why "We Can Still Defeat UMT," in spite of the war situation, if we work hard enough at it, because a division of opinion among conscription proponents about what type they want may make their efforts ineffective.

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the

Fellowship of Reconciliation

21 Audubon Avenue
New York 32, N. Y.

A. J. MUSTE, *Secretary*

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE,
International Secretary

ALFRED HASSLER, *Editor*

CONSTANCE MUSTE,
Assistant Editor

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Vera Brittain
Margueritte Harmon Bro
Allan Knight Chalmers
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Elisabeth D. Dodds
Eugene Exman
Caleb Foote
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Wallace Hamilton
Erna Harris
John Haynes Holmes
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Milton Mayer
Alfred D. Moore
Ferner Nuhn
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Edwin McNeill Poteat
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly except August. Re-entered as second-class matter July 1, 1947, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879; additional entry at Lebanon, Pa.

20 Cents a Copy $2 a year

Fellowship
the journal of the fellowship of reconciliation
January, 1951 Vol. XVII—No. 1

In a Time of Crisis . . .

In God's world no time is hopeless. This we affirm with resurgent faith. God's judgment that this world of men is worth the life he gave it was compellingly demonstrated for all time in the fact of Christmas. His will to save the world rising again and again out of disaster and tragedy was demonstrated everlastingly by the Cross. The unfailing availability of his infinite resources at any juncture of history is the constant example of his holy influence working in the lives of men.

Today's world is not lost. It may be saved if a great change of heart will come to many men, and if they will bring forth the fruits of that contrition and renewed dedication.

The immediate works of that nature which now must be advanced by the United States are:

1. The rejection of the use of the atom bomb in Korea.
2. The cessation of hostilities.
3. The referral of the conflict to United Nations adjudication.
4. The admittance of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations.

For the people of the Cross the works of repentance must be a constant witness in word and life, individually and in groups. In particular we urge renewed attention to the deep resources of prayer, the necessity of the disciplined life, and nonviolent action at every point where needs may be found. In the spirit of humility and hope we commit ourselves to these tasks, and the nations to the just and merciful guidance of our Maker.

National Council, F.O.R.
December 2, 1950

7595

1957

The spirit of Christ is there, and even while man denies it,

"It Glows in His Heart"

By A. J. MUSTE

FEW PEOPLE, if any, even pretend to feel cheerful about the world situation as this new year begins. Nevertheless, the first thing that needs to be said as we try to orient ourselves is that most of us are not aware of the depth and urgency of the crisis in which we live. Jesus predicted that in the day of the Son of Man people would behave as in the days of Noah, eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day Noah entered the ark and the floods came and carried them all away.

The Judgment Day

Edith Lovejoy Pierce tells us how it is in a poem entitled "Main Street U.S.A.," which appears in the little collection* she has just published:

The sky is turning dark:
We're going to have a squall.
Open your umbrella,
For the atom bomb will fall.
Starch the bedroom curtains,
Shine the silver tray,
Put on a little make-up—
Here comes the Judgment Day.

Because we do not understand and accept the full depth of the crisis, we also fail to realize how simple and yet profound and revolutionary the solution is. Here again Mrs. Pierce provides the text:

The season of questions is over
The winter of asking is done,...
Christ is the great affirmation:
Love is the only reply.

Nothing short of a rediscovery of Christ, a total acceptance of him, a Pentecost that will cause power to flow through us into the stream of history, will suffice now. Unless something happens on the deep spiritual level, nothing but disaster can take place on the political level. What is politically feasible or practical—things being as they are and we being what we are—is death.

It was an *atomic* event that occurred in 1945 in the physical realm. An atomic event must now occur in the political and spiritual realm, and it must take place first of all within us. It is probably true that we both long for and dread this incursion of God. When Augustine experienced a conversion, he "trembled exceedingly," according to his own report. It would appear that the sense of God working out a purpose in his life was accompanied, as one commentator puts it, "by the premonition that some awful renunciation would still be demanded of him."

However, it is not primarily on this element of the cost that is involved in becoming channels of healing power that I want next to dwell, but on something else that hinders a total acceptance of love's way: what we call our "realism."

* *Wind Has No Home*, by Edith Lovejoy Pierce. Published by the author, October 1950.

We want to be practical, and the way of love is not practical. It may be sentimental or revolutionary, but it is not practical in the usual sense of the term.

The Grand Inquisitor

Almost certainly the most magnificent statement of the problem is in certain passages of the Russian novelist, Dostoevsky, and especially in the story of *The Grand Inquisitor* told in *The Brothers Karamazov*. Let us recall the outline of the story. The Grand Inquisitor was the Cardinal of Seville in the days of the Inquisition. One day, just after the execution of many heretics, Jesus suddenly appeared in the center of the city. The people recognized him at once, saluted him, and called on him to heal their sick, which he did. He even raised from the dead a young girl being carried to the grave. Then the Cardinal appeared. He sized up the situation at once and told the guards, with a motion of his finger, to take Jesus away. "And such is his power, so completely are the people cowed into submission and trembling before him," that they let the guards lead Jesus away.

In the evening the Grand Inquisitor went alone to the cell in which Jesus had been placed. He explained to Jesus, who remained silent, why he was not welcome in Seville. Jesus had made the crucial mistake, according to the Cardinal, of not listening to Satan during the "temptation" in the wilderness. He should have raised "the banner of earthly bread." Above all, he should have realized that while men want to think that they are free and live according to conscience and the will of God, they do not really want to shoulder the heavy responsibility of freedom.

It is a part of Dostoevsky's profound insight that he does not represent the Cardinal as self-indulgent or a slave to fleshly passion or greedy or as a *mere* lover of power for its own sake, though it is clear that he is nevertheless an incarnation of the love of power in that most subtle of all forms, the desire to be "effective." In his youth the Cardinal was himself an extreme ascetic and a mystic. "Know," he exclaimed to the silent Jesus, "that I too have been in the wilderness, I too have lived on roots and locusts, . . . and I too was striving to stand among Thy elect." But, he continued, "I awakened and would not serve madness. I turned back and joined the ranks of those *who have corrected thy work.*" By means of "miracle, mystery and authority" practical men such as he will give men "the quiet humble happiness of weak creatures such as they are by nature."

The Clever People

Ivan Karamazov, the brother who tells the legend, insists that it is vulgar to think that ecclesiastical and political leaders are all motivated by greed and love of power: "Why can there not be among them one martyr oppressed by great sorrow and loving humanity? . . . And suddenly his eyes were opened and he saw that it *is no great moral blessedness to attain perfection and freedom,*" if at the same time he is aware that men in general cannot attain this level and that only disaster can come from trying to build society on such an illusion. "Seeing all that," Ivan concludes, the youthful idealistic Grand Inquisitor

"turned back and *joined—the clever people. Surely that could have happened?"* (Italics mine.)

Nor must we suppose that this statesman of the Church who improved upon Jesus and whose great object, pursued relentlessly, was to banish Jesus from his own heart, from the Church and from society, succeeded entirely. During the meeting in the cell Jesus remained absolutely silent, though "the old man longed for Him to say something, however bitter and terrible. But He suddenly approached the old man in silence and softly kissed him on his bloodless aged lips." Then the Inquisitor opened the door and told Jesus to go and to return "not at all, never, never!"

They Long to Follow

Alyosha, the other Karamazov brother, then asks Ivan what about the old man? And the answer is: "The kiss glows in his heart, but the old man adheres to his idea." That is to say, the old man is each of us, and especially the leaders of church and nation. For in the heart of each of them, too, the kiss of Christ glows. They long to follow him, even while they repudiate him as impractical. But they do repudiate him: each of us "adheres to his idea" of how he can improve on the way of love and commitment.

Our realism, which leads us to correct and improve upon Christ, has its real source, according to Dostoevsky, in lack of faith in man and in God. They are, of course, closely linked, or even two aspects of the same thing. That the Grand Inquisitor holds a low opinion of men, we have already seen. He, of course, is a superior being. He could have been one of Christ's elect. But he realizes that "it was not for such geese" as the common run of men, "that the great idealist dreamt his dream of harmony."

Among the numerous powerful passages in *The Grand Inquisitor*, none makes a more suddenly powerful impact on the reader than the one in which the final truth about *The Grand Inquisitor*—about Everyman—dawns on Alyosha Karamazov and breaks from his lips in a great shout. When Ivan has described how the once spiritually minded Cardinal joined "the clever people," Alyosha exclaims: "Joined whom, what clever people? They have no such great cleverness and no mysteries and secrets. . . . Perhaps nothing but atheism, that's all their secret. Your inquisitor does not believe in God, that's his secret."

Here, then, is our situation. In order to determine our course with respect to the vast problems with which we are confronted, nationally and on a world scale, we think that it is realistic and "clever"—and in any case "there isn't anything else we can do; we have no choice"—to take human beings as they are. By this we mean seeing them as predominantly selfish, short-sighted and weak; as ruthless and rebellious, and therefore above all having to be restrained and kept in their place by "the only means they understand," or else as submissive and dumb creatures who have to be manipulated for their own good. Then we calculate what can be done under these conditions, what we can reasonably expect to accomplish, and that becomes our policy.

But taking things and people as they are means in practice leaving God out of the reckoning. What people can be expected to do in their own wisdom and strength is

what we believe must be the basis of our action. We do not really believe in the possibility of an incursion of God into our own lives or into the life of the peoples of the earth, in power with which what is impossible to men might be accomplished. Not that we do not continue to talk about God and about men as children of God, to say prayers, and all the rest. But this is on the verbal and not on what may be called the existential level.

A Calculative Morality

In other words, the morality with which we really work is what Edward Leroy Long, Jr., called a "calculative morality."* And the upshot of our calculating is that the world is now plunged into incalculable and indescribable terrors. We are faced with the total irrationality and immorality of atomic war and totalitarianism (the latter incipiently in the United States as well). And lacking faith in the reality of any superhuman, divine power, in the moment when unlimited power is at our disposal, we are utterly frustrated. As Long says: "The issues at stake in historical situations involving the bomb become too big to be decided by merely weighing alternatives. . . . A religious ethic must rediscover obedience in a situation in which calculation becomes less and less possible, and leaps of faith the only means of facing contemporary issues."

Begin Again

The one indispensable and primary task for all of us, therefore, is to begin again at the beginning, "as little children." We must become through grace, by faith, persons, a group of persons, a "true church," a "fellowship of the Holy Spirit"—persons who actually "see" men, all men, as children of God and as such love them, and persons who experience the power of God in themselves. Such persons will embody and constitute a moral authority that the world will come to recognize as the Christian Church came to be recognized in the Roman Empire. They will be "salt" and "leaven" for our age.

One or two brief closing observations seem appropriate. In the first place, it is not the case that if we experience a true conversion and Pentecost, the problems of functioning in the world, though we are "not of it," will suddenly and automatically be solved by us. As if, having become as "little children" we should by magic be transformed into the cleverest and most successful politicians. Frank Lea*, brilliant English literary critic and one-time editor of *Peace News*, has made an observation about this that is of basic importance: "The new moral authority will not be indifferent to the material ordering of society." In striving to remove conditions that hinder a true human society and

* In a closely reasoned, indispensable little volume, *The Christian Response To the Atomic Crisis*, Westminster Press. The author's theology is neo-orthodox rather than liberal. In this book he states that he "as an individual, is convinced that the motivations of a pacifist stand furnish the best deterrent against misuse of the bomb. . . . Pacifism is perhaps the most sensitive Christian position in the immediate situation, and probably the only Christian position in the ultimate issue."

* *The Seed of the Church*, Sheppard Press, London, 1948. A very original analysis of Judaeo-Christian prophetism, the Early Church, Catholicism, Protestantism, and western culture.

establish those that favor such an order, "it will have to compromise at every step, to sacrifice a lesser good for a greater—all concrete problems of ethics being choices between relative evils. But never, never must it surrender to the notion that any means, however bad, is justified by the end: for there are means which violate the spirit of love, and to violate the spirit of love is to violate that which alone, whatever the material conditions, can finally progenerate love." That is to say, it makes all the difference in the world whether we begin—in which case we always eventually also end—with the material conditions, with human beings as they are, apart from God, or whether we begin with love and with the faith that divine power can flow into human history, and then proceed to deal with concrete issues. And this, of course, rules out any compromise, and calls rather for the most uncompromising break with war, which is by definition the use of any means. No church that compromises with modern violence can exercise any moral authority.

The Cost

Secondly, the cost of becoming the servant of Christ's love and the channel of God's power, is enormous. Very likely it is that which in the ultimate moment holds us back. Speaking of the Early Church, Frank Lea writes: "Those who, in Roman times, upheld an authority superior to the State, could not be blind to the cost, for they were required to pay it not only in defeat but in victory, and not only in war but in peace. The Chrsitian had to sacrifice everything to God as often as he was called upon to sacrifice anything to Caesar. . . . Yet there were thousands of Christian Martyrs. . . . Only a Church that could demonstrate its readiness to give up all could so impress the population of the Empire as to become its moral authority."

The Great Impulse

What if, however, we were again prepared to enact such a role in the "Empire" of our day? Let me turn to Dostoevsky again for an answer. The Devil—none other—is the author, according to Dostoevsky as well as Jesus, of our "realism," which makes Grand Inquisitors of cardinals and bombers out of Christian youths. But even Satan, according to another of the Russian novelist's works, is "tempted" to obey Christ instead. "I was there," Satan exclaims, "when the Word who died on the Cross rose up into heaven bearing on His bosom the soul of the penitent thief. . . . And I swear to you by all that's sacred, *I longed to join the choir and shout hosannah with them all. The word almost escaped me, had almost broken from my lips . . . but common sense—oh, a most unhappy trait of my character—kept me in due bounds, and I let the moment pass. For what would have happened, I reflected, what would have happened after my hosannah?*" (Italics mine.)

He would have been transformed, of course, into an angel of light, as will anyone who, when the voice sounds from "the hid battlements of eternity" and the great impulse comes, does not let the moment pass, but instead lets the hosannah break from his lips because it has taken possession of his will.

GERMANY'S MILITARY PHOENIX

Out of the ashes of stricken Germany rises again the grim prospect of a nation at arms.

By F. SIEGMUND-SCHULTZE

UNTIL THE SUMMER OF THIS YEAR the plans for remilitarization of Germany had all come from outside, but since about July the question has been hotly debated, both pro and con, within the country. Chancellor Adenauer has assured us that he has not made any direct offers to the Western Powers; but he entered into conversations which the High Commissioners of the occupying countries were able to use to indicate that there was a readiness on the part of Germany to negotiate about remilitarization. After that German rearmament was spoken of not only at the conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Atlantic Pact countries but also at the Strasburg meeting of the Council of Europe. At the most recent negotiations, German Ministers and members of the Federal Parliament also took part. The result of all these efforts and negotiations is that these matters have been discussed continually in the press and one could say that the Germans had almost unconsciously slipped into a situation where remilitarization is practically on the doorstep.

Remilitarization could take place in a number of different ways. The Labor Corps set up for the occupying powers are now being reconstituted and provided with arms. Even though they are only intended for local service, and this service is limited on principle to guard duty, yet the arming of these German auxiliary forces with carbines, etc., is to a certain extent remilitarization. The same applies to the police troops that are now being planned: whereas until recently it was only a matter of a protective police force, it has now been decided to have a security police of 30,000 men, who will also be armed with carbines and are to carry a few moderately heavy weapons. In addition to this there is continual discussion as to how far German troops are to be used as contingents in a European Army. Experts have been consulted as to what form such participation of Germany in the defense of Western Europe might take, and there is a persistent rumor that orders have already been given for the formation of a General Staff. We have also seen repeated proofs that sinister forces are at work installing former officers and soldiers in newly planned formations.

Even if we remain sceptical of all these rumors and intrigues, we cannot deny that, to the astonishment of all Germans, remilitarization is on the march. Whereas a few months ago practically every German took it for granted that the decisions made by the victorious powers at Potsdam would remain in force, according to which any form of German remilitarization, even in the most distant future, was to be prevented; and

whereas even up to a few weeks ago responsible German authorities assured us that no remilitarization was planned nor could a German Government allow it, yet we now find that all who have allowed themselves to be worked up into a mood of nationalism are of the opinion that without a German army, or the participation of Germany in the defense of Europe, there can be no possible future for Germany. The reasons usually given are that in overrunning South Korea the Russians have clearly revealed their plans. But in many cases we see the reappearance of old instincts long familiar to us and that have a similarity to something we knew in former times.

Whereas until now at all our meetings we had been able to get unanimous resolutions against the rearmament of Germany, the general mood has now changed: people say that our point of view is "pacifist" and therefore not in the national interest. We have already reached the stage when even the holding of meetings under the heading "Against Remilitarization" has become difficult, and this difficulty is increased by the fact that the Soviet propaganda in this field makes such peace work appear to be under Communist influence. West German propaganda has been foolish enough to succumb completely to this atmosphere, and in Western Germany all work for peace is discredited as being inspired by the Communists. Even long-standing peace organizations such as the FOR, all of which are forbidden in the Eastern Zone, are nevertheless accused of being in league with Eastern Zone interests. The German Peace Cartel, which has just held its annual meeting in Munster, had difficulty in arranging to hold a public meeting, and for the first time in recent years the government was not represented.

Because of all this, the FOR has been placed in the position of having to fight for its point of view. We must now struggle harder than ever before against a general opposition to our principles. The German Executive Committee of the Fellowship of Reconciliation has clearly declared that it will continue to oppose every form of

Only just recently polls of German newspapers showed clearly that no less than 73% of the German people are against any German militarism, and that no less than 84% would refuse to serve in a new German army. Is this not proof enough of the fact that we want peace, and that we have no intention to tolerate another reign of the Prussian jack-boot? Why do the democratic United States insist that a new German army be created? We are against war, and against a new German militarization, and we want the American people to know about our desire for peace. Adenauer and his backers are not speaking in the name of the German people. They are speaking in the name of those forces which wish to keep the world in constant terror, and for the purpose of a reintroduction of the established systems of yesteryear.

OSCAR PFAUS
Hamburg, Germany

remilitarization, both on principle and because of the present situation. The Executive Committee asked the Chairman of the German FOR to put before the Minister of the Interior our arguments against remilitarization. Following a Conference of the North Rhine-Westphalia Region of the FOR, the suggested interview took place and we made it clear to Dr. Heinemann, the Minister of the Interior, that the FOR felt bound to take up the fight against rearmament.

During this conversation the further question was raised as to whether, in the Minister's opinion,

---

In November and December Western Germany saw four hotly contested elections, in three of which the question of the rearmament of Germany was the major issue. They followed six months of discussion in which Pastor Martin Niemoeller and the Social Democratic party opposed remilitarization, and Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, head of the Christian Democratic Party, and many of the officials of the Confessional Church, favored it.

The summer's rumors that the Western nations were discussing the remilitarization of Germany became a major issue in October, when the Brethren Council of the Confessional Church sent a letter to Chancellor Adenauer denouncing alleged remilitarization plans and demanding new elections for the Lower House "in which the German people can decide for itself whether or not it wants to be rearmed." It was signed by 37 West German pastors, including Martin Niemoller, president of the Evangelical Church in Hessen and Nassau. Niemoller in his speeches urged Germans not to contribute toward "erecting a wall separating us from our eastern brothers," and called rearmament senseless, declaring that "every ten West German divisions would lead to the formation of ten Soviet Zone divisions. . . . Real freedom can be found only in prayer and love." Dr. Gustav Heinemann, president of the Synod of the Evangelical Church in Germany in November resigned as West German Minister of the Interior, because of Chancellor Adenauer's attempts to "foist rearmament on the country."

In late November and early December elections were held in the West German states of Hesse, Wuerttemburg-Baden, and Bavaria. The Social Democrats campaigned on an anti-rearmament platform, and they achieved large majorities in Bavaria and Hesse, and in Wuerttemburg-Baden took the lead over Chancellor Adenauer's Christian Democrats. Their reason for opposing rearmament was that they believe a German army would be a provocation to attack but a wholly inadequate defense against it unless Germany is restored to full international equality and the Allies send enough troops into West Germany to assure a successful defense in case of Russian attack. While their motives were ambiguous, voting for them was the only way in which German voters could show their opposition to remilitarization, and no one knows how much of their vote was due to plain anti-militarist sentiment. In the later election in West Berlin the major issue was anti-communism, but it was said that Berliners were more favorable to remilitarization than other West Germans. The Social Democrats there slipped from 64.5% of the vote to 44.6%, remaining the largest single party but facing a coalition that could outweigh it.

it would be possible to carry out a plebiscite, even though such a thing was not provided for in the Constitution. He believed that it was, since a plebiscite was not forbidden by the Constitution, and also since at the time of the final draft of the basic law it was generally agreed that there was to be no question of remilitarizing Germany. During the interview the question of conscientious objection to war (which is sanctioned in the draft of the Constitution but has not yet been passed as a law) was also discussed, and the wish of the Fellowship of Reconciliation expressed that this law should be passed as soon as possible. On this point we were able to start negotiations that will lead to further action. In addition, the German Peace Cartel has accepted the suggestion of the FOR and issued this resolution:

> Convinced
>
> that remilitarization of the Federal Republic of Western Germany is just as contrary to the interests of the German people as the remilitarization of the German Democratic Republic of Eastern Germany
>
> and further, that the remilitarization of Germany is contradictory to the will of the victorious powers as expressed at the time of the capitulation, and also to the will of the German people as expressed in their various Constitutions,
>
> The German Peace Cartel demands:
>
> that the Federal Government should immediately put before the Bundestag (Federal Parliament) a law providing for a plebiscite of the German people on the question of remilitarization.

At the same time the German Peace Cartel urges all classes of the German people not to let their aims be altered for the sake of outside interests, and not to let themselves be driven in the wrong direction through the whipping up of nationalistic feelings—the terrible effects of this should be clear from the experiences of the last few decades. In taking part in a war between East and West the German people would put the seal on their own destruction and at the same time deprive mankind of that service for peace which, after all that has happened, and in their position as the centre of Europe, it is their duty to render. If ever a call from God has gone out to the German people to fulfill their duty to humanity, it is in this fateful hour, when a disarmed Germany could lead the other nations to the way of peace.

It is clear that a struggle has now sprung up in Germany that only a few months ago would have been considered impossible. Contrary to all the assurances that the representatives of the occupying powers in Germany and the representatives of the German people have given throughout the past five years, remilitarization is being forced on the German people, although, in spite of all propaganda, it is probably still against their will. The prohibition of all opposition to remilitarization has gone so far that the Chancellor recently said in public—jokingly of course—that he wished the use of the word "remilitarization" were punishable with six months imprisonment. At any rate there are forces at work trying to prevent all free expression of opinion. Now it is indeed the task of all who work for freedom and peace to oppose a development that seems bound to lead soon to a third world war on German soil.

In a time of chaos and crisis men of good will must continue their

Apocalyptic Peacemaking

By FERNER NUHN

WE MUST RISK A JUDGMENT as to what the times are like. To me, they seem apocalyptic, portentous though that word is. Some of the extraordinary events of the times are these: the dividing of the world into two and only two great spheres of power; the pressure of ever more serious practical decisions and ever more serious moral decisions on people everywhere; the rapid reversals of position forced on people when they decide things on limited grounds of self and group interest. (For example, the national enemy of a little while ago becomes the ally of today, and vice versa; peace groups, too, find themselves drawn toward other groups with apparent similar interests but different motivations, and these patterns rapidly shift.) Geometric progression in the destructiveness of war weapons, topped by the power to release atomic or cosmic force; a similar geometric progression in the material and economic cost of using such weapons; the necessity of using such weapons at whatever cost, according to the present beliefs and ideas of nations and of the most people everywhere; the inability to make normal peace treaties and resume the usual processes of interim peace; the drawing together in more and more substantial union of nations within each power sphere; a growing conviction of the necessity of world government on the part of many people; the evident value, even to the present bellicose nations, of the limited legal and moral sanctions of the present United Nations. These are phenomena of the times which have never really appeared before.

I wish I might add to these things a widespread turning of people to ultimate religious truth and experience. It would be fair to say, I think, that there is a tendency in that direction. In any case, the confidence of people in some of the earlier ideals of the century, such as science and politics, as all-sufficient solutions to human affairs, has been greatly shaken.

Taken together, such developments seem to suggest that this is not just another critical time in the world's history, but is a test of the destructive and constructive forces in humanity, on a world-around scale.

The world at present is rather like a vigorous but wilful man whose wrong living and various ills are now compounding into a single virulent malady. Whereas he used to recover piecemeal from piecemeal ailments, and could bounce back, in a few days, from his wild debauches, now he has no leisure for recovery. The whole body is involved, and the fever is rising. At a certain time he must decide, not merely to quit his bad habits for a time, but to give up

wrong-doing itself—if he wants to live and not to die.

In trying to measure the world's plight at the present time, one thinks of certain sentences in Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address:

> The Almighty has his purposes. . . . Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may soon pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled up by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and every drop of blood drawn by the lash shall be paid for by another drawn by the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said, "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

True and Righteous

With appropriate substitutions, here is a rule, it seems to me, which applies to the terrible world conflict that is now in some stage of progress. Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray that this conflict may somehow be halted, and the conditions for true reconciliation and peace be met. But if, in the failure of nations to repent and be reconciled, it should continue, spread and intensify until all the wealth piled up by superior might be sunk, and every wrong done through the sword be paid for by the suffering of those who take the sword, still it must be said, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

Is this an unjust rule, or is it a just one? If God really is just, if the world is under moral law, does it not necessarily apply? If it does apply, does it not give us a rough measure of the possible depth and length of the world crisis, before we may look for a true turning point?

There is much substance, wealth, strength in the world, just as there is much pride, wilfulness, ignorance and error, on both sides of the conflict. Only when such wealth and such pride fall sufficiently low, may we look for a true turning point in the world's crisis. When the patient is sufficiently exhausted, then he may be willing to turn and make the hard decisions necessary for a real cure.

That point would not seem likely to arrive in the next few years. And yet, considering the speed of events, it might well come within a decade or two. If there is much substance in the world, there is also a huge new capacity to destroy substance. And if there is much error, there is also the rapid means to uncover error. For example, if Communists have erroneously supposed that all colored people are so abused by western white nations that they are ready to revolt, then they suddenly find colored troops of the United States confronting them formidably in South Korea. Meanwhile, if western nations have supposed Orientals to be lacking in self-respect, morale and fighting skill, then they suddenly find themselves confronted by a Pearl Harbor or a North Korea.

But if it seems the world conflict must move toward a true crisis and turning point, like that faced by a man in serious illness, it may not move at a steady rate or in a straight line. It may well go through alternate periods of "hot" and "cold" war. The Korean war, in progress as I write, may, or may not be concluded without spreading into a general conflict. But until the world actually meets the true conditions for peace, any cessation of "hot" war can only

be temporary, and the conflict must move on once more toward a true crisis. Just when such a crisis might arrive, no one, of course, can say.

Meanwhile, the signs are not all bad, by any means. Even as the crisis deepens, the patient takes belatedly some of the steps that may work toward his recovery. A great "capitalist" nation like the United States gives away huge amounts of capital toward the economic welfare of other countries. Two such ancient enemies as France and Germany consider pooling their iron and coal resources. Through the murk and tragedy of Korea has gleamed the faint light of legal and moral international procedure.

A true crisis has the hope in it of radical change and cure. The world crisis has in it that hope. I believe that God is working in these dramatic times with a sure hand. The laws of truth and goodness are not suspended, but are operating, with furious force and speed, all over the globe.

The role of peacemakers in such a crisis seems clear, to hold and purify their witness, to publish the conditions necessary for real peace at every stage of conflict, and be ready and qualified whenever opportunity arrives to help provide that margin of healing power which can tip the balance toward recovery and a new life.

What is the present stage of the crisis, from a truly "apocalyptic" or world point of view? If this analysis is correct, it is not an advanced stage, even though it might pass quite rapidly into more advanced stages. But as I write, in the latter months of 1950, the world is far from shaken in its faith in might and material things. The nations and people are not at all ready to give up what they have won by superior arms. The enchantment of owning things is strong upon people everywhere. Security and order appear to be defended by superior force—not, as is actually the case so far as they exist, by justice, good faith and mercy. The present stage is one of faith in false things and in wrong ways.

The Word Is "Repent"

The word for this stage is "repent." Repent, or suffer the consequences. Repent of turning the light of the mind and the craft of the hand to contriving more and more terrible ways of destruction. Repent of wasting the God-given materials and forces of nature. Repent of putting national sovereignty and loyalty above every other claim. Repent of the wrong way the world has taken and is still taking: the way of bombs dropped on populous cities, the way of Marxist deceit, materialism and class conflict, the way of western white supremacy, the way of eastern cruelty and indifference to human personality, the way of human pride, greed and selfishness.

Repent of religious shallowness and conventionality and of religious conceit, self-righteousness and unbrotherliness. Repent of suburbanite complacency and fear of not being respectable. Repent of reformist intellectual pride, impatience and narrowness.

Repent, and other steps may follow: disarmament, a true world government and those other goals of security and freedom which men everywhere long for. But men can take a second and third step only after they have taken the first one. And only those who have repented

themselves and are seeking to purify their lives can convincingly ask others to repent.

Queries for Peacemakers

How may we qualify ourselves for peacemaking in a time of world crisis?

Faith: Do you believe in God? Do you believe in the great, good eternal Power, who is not mocked, but moves through all history and has a design for mankind? If I ground my life in the love and strength of God, I can meet the conditions for peacemaking in a dangerous world. When the atom bomb was dropped on Bikini in 1947, I resolved to live wherever my tasks might take me, regardless of atom bombs. I have no wish to die. I much prefer to live, in these exciting times. Yet, expecting to die in any case, I desire to live according to my best faith and aims. If you and I try to save our lives, we will lose them; if we are ready to lose them for the sake of truth, we will save them. Do you seek for the guidance of God in each act of your peace witness?

Purity: Have you examined your motives for peacemaking to see if they are really pure and not self-seeking? A time of crisis will search out every false motive and position in pacifists as well as others. Is your peace position not, after all, a disguise for something else: pride at being different and more intelligent than other people? squeamishness at seeing blood flow? desire to avoid the sacrifices of military service? selfish love of a son, brother, husband, and desire to keep him out of danger? anger at militarists and an imperfect human society? desire for power and position on one's own part?

Is your relation to your property and way of livelihood such that you feel free to live and act according to your best instincts and vision? Is your emotional life chaotic, or are you clear, honest, responsible and true in your relations to those nearest you? Are you master of your appetites, or are you bound to certain indulgences, as for tobacco, alcohol, caffeine drinks, excessive eating or other gratifications of the senses? Consider the strange fact that in the wretchedness following in the wake of the last war, cigarettes were valued by many people even more than food, and passed for money. A shortage of many things seems almost certain in the years ahead, especially for the United States with its huge and growing commitments all over the globe which are certain to stretch its economy to the limit. Hoarding, or trying to put oneself in a better position, materially, than one's neighbors is a form of stealing. Are you preparing yourself mentally and morally for such conditions as may come?

Knowledge: Are you trying to inform yourself on world conditions and on national and world affairs? Are you learning all you can about the history, culture and contemporary movements of China, Mongolia, Siberia, Russia, India, Tibet, Iran, and the many other countries of the world, whose destinies draw ever closer to our own? God entrusts power and responsibility to those who are wise and informed as well as pure in heart. Where you lack adequate information, do you refrain from decided judgments and opinions? Do you look at circumstances and events chiefly to corroborate an opinion already formed, or do you view the world

afresh day by day, seeking to form a new and clearer judgment, closer to disinterested truth?

Humility and Courage: One of Gandhi's rules for action in Satyagraha was that of "the irreducible minimum":

> For in Satyagraha, the minimum is also the maximum, and as it is the irreducible minimum, there is no question of retreat. The only possible movement is advance.

This is a rule which American peace workers, living in a relatively free and generous society, have often failed to apply to American conditions. It means limiting our differences, in the stand we take, to a minimum, on which position, however, we are willing to stake everything, including life. It means conceding all we can to the claims and virtues of our society, before we decide we must take a different and more difficult course. Only if our righteousness exceeds that of patriots and soldiers, will moral power flow to us.

Refusing to participate in destructive actions, are you ready to serve wherever you can in constructive actions? Are you prepared to give as much for the things you believe in as others give for the things they believe in?

Do you "take a stand" because it seems right, and neither to avoid nor to court civil disobedience? Where your stand separates you from your society, is it the "irreducible minimum" of difference?

If you are above draft age, do you recognize your relative freedom from those sacrifices which your views, if followed, may bring upon younger persons? Do you allow yourself to overbear and overinfluence other people, to their later disillusion and reaction, or do you fully respect the freedom of conscience and moral responsibility of everyone? Do you put an obstacle in your neighbor's way by being so disagreeable, as a noncooperator, that he learns to dislike the whole idea of pacifism; or does your reasonableness and magnanimity make your peace witness attractive?

Do you respect the position and sincerity of public officials to whom you make requests or representations? Do you take into account their own limited powers, or do you ask of them things they could not do if they wished to?

Love: Do you have sympathy and love for the actual people in the world, not merely for the vague generalization known as "mankind"? Do you try to bring reconciliation near at hand, wherever there are differences, before trying to bring it far away? Do you know peace and love in yourself before offering them to others? Are you thankful for all the good things with which God, after all, provides you? Are you appreciative of as much peace, order, friendliness, generosity, cooperation and good will as you find in your society? Do you find an inner joy and satisfaction in whatever you are led to do because of your peace witness, regardless of its difficulty or of its apparent results?

> It is easy in the world to live after the world's opinion; it is easy in solitude to live after our own; but the great man is he who, in the midst of the crowd, keeps with perfect sweetness the independence of solitude.
>
> RALPH WALDO EMERSON

With the pro-conscription forces divided, if we work at it hard enough

We Can Still Defeat UMT

By JOHN M. SWOMLEY, JR.

"I AM AFRAID IT IS TOO LATE NOW," were the opening words of a letter I received a short time ago from a friend in Pittsburgh, who had for years been working to prevent the passage of Universal Military Training. In the letter was a clipping from the Pittsburgh *Post Gazette* with these words underlined: "The chances of winning approval of a UMT program are better now while the country is emotionally keyed up over war in Korea."

The chances were in fact so good that UMT would probably have passed last summer if President Truman had not advised against it. With an eye to the approaching elections and a knowledge that the Army could not handle both a war and a UMT program, the President urged caution.

Now, some months later, with the elections out of the way, by one of the strange coincidences of politics there is a real chance that UMT may be defeated.

Here is the account of that coincidence. The Army has for six years spent millions of dollars in efforts to "educate" Congress and the people on the need for UMT. In these efforts it had the loyal support of the American Legion, President Truman, and many other influential citizens. But when these efforts, with the aid of the Korean war, seemed about to succeed, the Army no longer wanted UMT. No one seemed to know how to draft boys for six months of UMT when the Army wanted those same boys for war in Korea. Nor did the Army know how it would train UMT boys without weakening the Regular Army. As Hanson Baldwin, the New York *Times* military writer, pointed out: "A training cycle of six months' duration would require so large a number of instructors and trainers who would otherwise be eligible for duty in active combat type units that the 'readiness potential' of the Regular Army would be decreased rather than increased by UMT."

But for six years the Army had told the nation UMT was indispensable to security. And Congress and the American Legion wanted to be secure!

With this problem on its hands and knowing that war is its ally, the Army promptly began a campaign to get the program it really wanted—Universal Military Service on the German pattern.

UMT, wrote Hanson Baldwin, was never thought of by the Army "as a realistic military" program but was "devised as a politically palatable measure." It was, in other words, the entering wedge or the stepping-stone toward the more drastic Prussian system.

Under Universal Military Service every boy would, upon reaching the age of 18, be drafted into the Army, Navy, or Air Force for

a period of at least two years. He could be sent anywhere in the world for his training and service, and would even after his discharge still be liable to "call." This program "would include even the physically unfit," said the New York *Times,* for they "would be trained for civil defense, defense jobs, or other necessary work."

Grounds for Hope

To many Americans who know that Congress often gives the Army a blank check in wartime, any real hope of defeating UMS may seem little short of fantastic. Nevertheless there are grounds for hope. For one thing, the American Legion has refused to endorse UMS. It feels that after the crisis is over Congress might repeal something so drastic, whereas there is a chance that something milder like UMT would be permanent. And the Legion does want *permanent* conscription.

President Truman himself, and others of influence who have been "sold" on UMT, are not yet ready to endorse Universal Military Service. Moreover, millions of Americans, including some who favor UMT, still do not like the idea of anything so drastic as UMS. The Navy and Air Force are not eager for UMS. Under the present law they are permitted to enroll volunteers and volunteers are generally better soldiers than those forced into uniform. Under UMS they would have to take conscripts assigned to them.

Add to this the fact that there is in operation a temporary Selective Service law which steadily supplies the generals with soldiers. Congress may decide to settle for a simple extension of that law. Such a course would, says Carl Vinson, the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, arouse less controversy than any attempt to pass either UMT or UMS.

Like German Militarism

There is, then, a chance that both UMT and UMS may be avoided. Everything, however, will depend upon the extent to which Congress believes there is strong opposition to these measures.

Those who believe passionately in peace and freedom will once again have to provide that strong opposition to adopting in America the heart of the Prussian system of militarism. Lest there be any doubt that the American Army aspires to be like the pre-war German army, one has only to read the following from the pen of Colonel Joseph I. Greene, editor of the *Infantry Journal.* In 1944, in an introduction to a book on German militarism, he said:

> "It is no condonation of the German attempt to conquer the world . . . to say that the German Army has continued to be our 'first military school' for most of the century and a half since Washington called it that. Nor to say that since the day of Steuben at Valley Forge, American military leaders have closely watched the German military developments, studied intensively the German military thought, and often adapted German military organization and tactical methods to our own uses.
>
> "Consequently, German military methods had their impact upon every commander of American troops since the beginning of the nation. And those who have shaped our ways of fighting have looked more often to the German than to any other foreign sources of military ideas. They have found profitable a close examination of German thought on warfare, not simply on the higher levels of

military theory, but also in the practical sphere of instruction for the individual soldier and the combat unit."

As all who have studied the rise of totalitarianism in Germany know, there was a definite correlation between the German military system and the rise of Nazism. Hitler regarded himself from the very outset as an exponent and aid of the military. And Hitler believed that before Germany could really be changed from the kind of social democracy it was under the Weimar Republic into a National Socialist dictatorship, the civilian population had to be organized in peacetime as if it were an army in war.

"The Duty of Arms"

Every totalitarian nation is organized according to the military concepts of leadership, discipline, command, and obedience. As early as 1924, in speaking of the goal he wanted to establish, Hitler said: "First of all, the highest which we as Germans know, the duty of arms, compulsory military service, must be restored."

Peacetime conscription was only the beginning in Germany. The colleges became the center of the shock troop movement and the nature of industry changed. Dr. Robert Ley spoke of the employers' function as an officer's function, and the workers' function as a soldier's function.

The same influences are at work in the American Army. An ROTC comic book recently put out by the Army in an effort to get college students to take ROTC, points out that ROTC will help boys get executive positions in industry. It adds, "A study of the organization of the Army will be a great help to you, especially since many civilian industries are similar to Army organization."

Militarism and Foreign Policy

The Army since the war has been quietly organizing industry. Employers are made Reserve Officers and employees are enlisted as ordinary soldiers, with the understanding that in time of crisis all will be in the Army.

Even the National Security Act of 1947 (often called the "unification law") that created the National Security Council in which the military can to a large degree control foreign policy, was a product of the German officer class. The *United States News* of Sept. 8, 1950 reported an interview with Col. Gen. Heinz Guderian, former Chief of Staff of the German Army under Hitler, which revealed that he wrote at the request of some American Army officers a 20-page typewritten document which sold the American Army leadership on the principles later embodied in the National Security Act of 1947.

Americans need to be more aware of the relationship of conscription to militarism and totalitarianism. They also need to see clearly the relationship of such militarism to the kind of foreign policy that breeds war. It is military training both in peacetime and wartime that to a large degree has created in America the powerful support, symbolized in the American Legion and similar groups, for the concept of peace through military strength. It is military training that has made so many Americans defer to the opinion of a man just because he is a general.

Moreover, there is a very real

relationship of such attitudes to the disastrous international events of recent months. Despite India's warning that the Chinese Communists would attack if American troops crossed the 38th Parallel in Korea, and despite British pleas that MacArthur's troops halt well before the Manchurian frontier so as to leave a buffer zone between the UN armies and China, MacArthur insisted on going ahead. One reason why the President of the United States felt he had to disregard more cautious advice from India, Britain and some of his own civilian advisers, was given by veteran correspondent James Reston in the November 30 New York *Times*. General MacArthur "was supported strongly on Capitol Hill and in the country, and any open break with him certainly could not have done President Truman any good in the election. . . . For specific reasons known only to himself, Mr. Truman rejected the cautious policy and followed the bold policy. Fairly or unfairly, it now is being said that one of his reasons for doing so was that *he feared a break* with his Korean commander." (Emphasis supplied.)

When military leaders have so much influence over foreign policy that the President fears to take a different course, Americans should ponder well what still more militarism would do to peace and democracy.

The United States is already perilously close to accepting the idea that international problems must be dealt with by force or the threat of force. The passage now of permanent Universal Military Training or Universal Military Service would be a further step in the direction of this idea that the problems that exist between Russia and America must eventually be solved by war. The proponents of permanent conscription espouse this philosophy and have done nothing toward encouraging world disarmament. They do not work to persuade the United States to abandon its support of colonialism, nor to use surplus grains to feed the millions of famine-stricken Chinese, nor to put its wealth and influence into lifting the standard of living of the masses of poor people throughout the world. Instead of trying to oppose communism in the only effective way—by adopting policies that will win the masses of the world away from communism—they advocate pouring wealth into armaments to defend the *status quo*.

The hope of the future lies in persistent efforts to find a basis for disarmament other than the positions which the Russians and Americans have maintained for the past several years. Until such efforts are made in good faith, proponents of UMT or UMS are guilty not only of militarism but of preparing for a war they will not try to prevent.

> "Recently we have heard much of Universal Military Service. Universal Military Service in peacetime is conscription, and as such, The American Legion has for 30 years opposed it and now opposes it. As a permanent policy, it would create a financial burden that our economy, based on free enterprise, cannot stand. It is not democratic because it would create a professional army ruled above by a military caste and fed below by private citizens."
>
> NATIONAL SECURITY COMMISSION, American Legion, November 1950

Chinese Army Fighting in Korea, Motives of Communists Discussed

The motives behind the intervention of Chinese troops in the Korean War against UN forces are being widely discussed. Is it simply a move in a Communist campaign for world domination, or are the economic and political factors in the immediate situation of primary importance?

The Christian Science Monitor in its November 29 issue comes out for the latter as the primary motive, calling attention to the fact that Manchuria, on Korea's northern border, is China's only center of heavy industries, and that it is an exceptionally rich region in minerals such as coal, gold, tungsten, copper, iron and zinc, particularly in the Yalu River region along the border. It also calls attention to the importance of the Yalu River dam, one of the biggest in the world, which is situated right on the border and supplies power to this big industrial region as well as to northern Korea.

If, as someone else has pointed out, we visualize the state of Florida as having roughly the same geographical relation to the United States that Korea has to China, and if our greatest industrial plants and raw material sources were in Georgia and Alabama, divided from Florida by only an imaginary geographical line, the United States would probably view with considerable alarm the advance of a Russian army up the peninsula of Florida to within 50 miles of the border of Georgia.

One tragic aspect of the "new war" in Korea is the possibility that it might have been averted had General MacArthur not launched his "home-by-Christmas" offensive on Thanksgiving Day. India had informed the U.S. and other nations fighting on the UN side that China would certainly intervene if UN forces drove north of the 38th Parallel. Chinese "volunteers" fighting for North Korea had become more and more numerous but as of Thanksgiving the Chinese had been out of contact with UN forces for weeks. They had released two groups of American prisoners with the message that the Chinese "did not want to fight Americans." The British, alarmed at American belligerence, had assured the Peiping government that the UN had no designs on Chinese interests in Korea or on Manchuria itself, and urged the UN nations to negotiate for establishment of a buffer area along the Yalu River as a means of satisfying China that no threat to her territory was contemplated. On top of all this, the Chinese delegation was due to arrive at Lake Success the day after Thanksgiving, and there were high hopes among UN delegates that peace might be negotiated.

The offensive was based on assurances from General MacArthur's intelligence that the Chinese would not come into the war if UN troops pushed to the Manchurian border. The General now maintains that the Chinese offensive had been planned long before and would have come anyway, and asserts that there are 1,000,000 Chinese troops in Korea and Manchuria

now. But it might be that the preparations had been of the "in case" variety, and that the offensive might not have been launched had UN forces remained inactive a while longer.

This does not mean, of course, that the situation would have been changed fundamentally, or that such a development would have been a step toward genuine peace. What it does mean is that the spread of hostilities might have been postponed a while longer—and while there is peace there is hope.

"Alternative" Banned from U.S. Mails

The September-October issue of the radical pacifist monthly *Alternative* was banned from the mails, the editors were informed in a letter from Albert Goldman, New York Postmaster. The issue contained a discussion of disarmament and an appeal to men to refuse to be drafted or to make or transport weapons of war. The appeal was addressed to the men who have failed to show up for registration or to be drafted, of whom there appear to be more than Selective Service expected. (In New York City, SS officials announced recently that one man in eight had failed to appear.) The ban was based, according to the Postmaster's letter, on a postal regulation dealing with "advocating or urging treason, insurrection or forcible resistance to any law of the United States." *Alternative's* Editorial Committee consists of Robert Auerbach, David Dellinger, Ralph DiGia, Roy Finch, Sander Katz, Roy C. Kepler, Irving Ravin and Margaret Rockwell, some of whom are FOR members. So far as is known, this is the first instance of the banning of a publication for political or anti-war reasons since World War II.

NMHF Merges with Other Organizations

The National Mental Health Foundation, founded during the war by COs on detached service working in mental hospitals, has merged with the other two leading voluntary organizations in the mental health field to form the National Association for Mental Health.

Status of Foreign Pacifists Clarified

As a result of detention of some members of the Jehovah's Witnesses when they came to this country in June to attend an international convention of Witnesses in New York City, the FOR and the American Civil Liberties Union have sought clarification of the position of the Immigration Department. It was stated in the papers at the time that the Witnesses' advocacy of "extreme pacifism" was the reason for their detention and questioning, and the ACLU wrote the immigration authorities that it was their understanding that there was no regulation stating that such a person is a danger to the public safety.

In reply, the Department's spokesman said: "You are correct in your assumption that no regulation such as you described has been promulgated. Furthermore, I know of no case in which an alien has been ordered excluded from the United States because he advocated extreme pacifism, even vigorously."

F.O.R. Council Discusses Policy

On December 1 and 2 the National Council met in New York to consider the work of the FOR. It had not met since the outbreak of war in Korea, and there was evident a deep sense of the importance of the FOR's message and of the responsibility of the Council in this time of grave crisis.

The Council reviewed the work of the past year, during which the major emphasis has been on bringing the pacifist message into the churches and theological seminaries, and to colleges. A. J. Muste has devoted a large portion of his time to work with the Church Peace Mission, which grew out of the Detroit Conference on the Church and War of last May. Although public meetings have not been large, there have been many excellent meetings with ministers and church workers, and opportunities to speak in seminaries and colleges. The Council indicated its interest in continuing in this work, and its approbation for the excellent job done by the Rev. Robert Weiskotten, Director of the Mission.

Staff members reported the interested and thoughtful reception of the pacifist message by college students, who are eager for a really revolutionary philosophy in the face of the chaos and frustration of the world situation. The concentrated field work recommended by the Council last May is being done by various staff members, with somewhat varied reactions. The staff recommended, and the Council agreed, that it should be continued. The Methodist Pacifist Fellowship applied for affiliation with the FOR, and was accepted enthusiastically.

The Council urgently protested any use of the atom bomb to the President, the Secretary of State and General Marshall. It also issued a statement on the report of the Commission on the Christian Conscience and Weapons of Mass Destruction of the National Council of Churches, which is summarized elsewhere in this issue.

In a statement on the deplorable state of civil liberties, particularly in relation to unpopular political points of view, the Council called for the repeal of the McCarran Internal Security Act and the Smith Act under which 11 Communist leaders have been convicted. It gave hearty support to those who, for reasons of conscience, religious conviction, or a serious desire to safeguard the democratic way of life, refuse to take oaths or answer questions in accordance with such laws. Finally, the Council urged individual FOR members and groups throughout the country to be alert to anti-democratic developments in their communities and to combat them nonviolently.

The Council adopted a budget for 1951 approximately the size of that for 1950. However, there were some increased expenses, such as the yearly salary increment provided in the salary scale; a 2½% increase in salaries to all employees, which was felt necessary to catch up a little with the rise in the cost of living; and a sum of about $850 for Social Security, which the staff voted for when the FOR became eligible recently. To provide for these, since the Council foresaw no increase in income, it was necessary to cut the budget at certain points where it was hoped the curtailment of work would be least.

It was therefore agreed not to increase the previously reduced

allowance for secretarial help to the regional offices; and not to open a Southern office at the present time. The Council expressed its continuing concern for the work in the South and its priority if funds should become available. The Council further felt obliged to discontinue its share in the employment of the Middle Atlantic Student Secretary, Charles Walker, after June 30. (He is now employed two-thirds by the Philadelphia FOR and one-third by National.) In addition an arrangement was made with the New York FOR for George Houser to spend half of his time on the city work there, in place of the present half-time Secretary, Francis Hall, and for New York to employ only half-time stenographic help. Some minor cuts were made in office expenses, and the total brought the budget within anticipated income.

The Council discussed the report of the committee set up to evaluate the summer projects of the FOR, and adopted its recommendations that the Interracial Workshops be continued and the Caravans be replaced by a project placing more emphasis on training for young people, which would include discussion of pacifist theory and techniques. This is, however, to include a substantial period for "training through experience" in speaking at summer camps, in churches and at street meetings, and other peace education techniques which might include activities similar to those in which last summer's Caravans engaged. There will be a week at the end for evaluation and rededication.

At its last session, the Council discussed the present crisis from the most basic standpoint, and decided upon a retreat in February or March to go into it more deeply. The main difference in outlook was between those who feel that the overarching trend of our day is toward war, which is inevitable unless a very fundamental and basic change takes place in the hearts of a great number of men and in the entire social order; and those who feel that, while the situation is very grave, and great changes are necessary, war is never inevitable and we must continue to work against all steps leading to war. The difference in practice would seem to be that the former believe that we must concentrate our efforts on preaching pacifism, including unilateral disarmament and the need for nonviolent revolution, in the strongest way we can, while anticipating the likelihood of another world holocaust; while the latter believe that such short-term and immediate jobs as fighting conscription and increased militarization, and campaigns for universal disarmament, may delay war and give an opportunity for other forces to come into play which may avert war altogether. This was felt to be a vitally important and fruitful subject, and it will be discussed in articles by various FOR members in forthcoming issues of FELLOWSHIP.

New Members Elected to Council

The membership of the FOR in November re-elected to the National Council of the FOR Charles Boss, Henry Hitt Crane, Passmore Elkinton, Caleb Foote, Nelson Fuson, Cecil Hinshaw, John Haynes Holmes, Walter Muelder, Sheldon Rahn and Douglas Steere. Newly elected to the Council were William Clark, Bernard Clausen and Emily Parker Simon.

Churchmen Sanction Possible Use of Bomb

If atomic weapons, or others of parallel destruction, were used against the United States or our allies, we would be justified in using them ourselves, said fourteen members of a commission of sixteen appointed by the Federal Council of Churches to consider *The Christian Conscience and Weapons of Mass Destruction.* "We believe that American military strength, which must include atomic weapons as long as any other nation may possess them, is an essential factor in the possibility of preventing world war and tyranny. . . . If atomic weapons or other weapons of parallel destruction are used against us or our friends in Europe or Asia, we believe that it could be justifiable for our government to use them in retaliation with all possible restraint." While endorsing other parts of the report, Dr. Robert L. Calhoun of Yale and Dr. Georgia Harkness of Garrett Biblical Institute, both FOR members, dissented from the above expression of opinion. "The ruling assumption throughout," said Dr. Calhoun in his statement, "is that if we are attacked, we must do whatever is needed to win. This perspective may be defended on political and cultural grounds. It can scarcely be regarded as distinctively Christian. Still less is it ecumenical."

The National Council of the FOR, which met shortly after, issued a statement commenting on the report. It pointed out that such expressions coming through the Federal Council, though made by individuals and not official pronouncements, carried great weight, and called attention to the fact that less than three days later President Truman made his statement that the United States was considering use of the atomic bomb in Korea. While not implying, of course, that there was any direct connection, the FOR felt that the knowledge that a number of prominent churchmen had given moral backing to such a course was a factor, and perhaps an important one, in the situation.

F.O.R. Disagrees

The FOR statement urged that reports like that under discussion should include not only a general recognition that there are differing points of view on such subjects, but a presentation of the pacifist side by side with the nonpacifist proposals. It also made three comments on the Commission report, the first calling attention to its failure to take into account the extent to which original use of the atom bomb had contributed to the present tragic insecurity of the world. It then pointed out that in arguing that force is required to undergird law and implying that the atom bomb might thus be used, the report failed to consider the warning of Amsterdam that the entire concept of a just war is challenged when the nature of the force employed is such as to undermine justice and destroy social order. Finally, it suggested that it is not a duplication or endorsement of their own "wisdom" but a distinctive word which men and nations need to hear from the Church of Christ, a word that will renew men's faith in the weapons of the spirit, rather than sanction resort to ever more diabolical weapons.

Pledge Brotherhood Campaign Under Way

Because last year's campaign was so successful as an initial effort, the Pledge Brotherhood Campaign will be carried on again this year during February. Sponsored by the FOR and the Congress of Racial Equality, and endorsed by such people as John Dewey, A. Philip Randolph, Dorothy Maynor, Lillian Smith and Harry Emerson Fosdick, among others, the Campaign statement declares that "Brotherhood is a way of life. It asks more than belief, more than lip service, more than sermons and speeches and interracial meetings. It asks to be lived. Last year, during Brotherhood Month, a few hundred Americans pledged themselves to try new ways of carrying their belief in brotherhood beyond words. The results were so moving and encouraging that this year the idea they pioneered will be carried on by thousands instead of hundreds."

Those who participate pledge:

"that where it is at all possible for me to do so, I will refrain during Brotherhood Month (February) from patronizing any place of business, recreation, or worship that does not admit on equal terms all men of whatever racial or ethnic group;

"that I will make a real effort to extend my friendship among those of other groups;

"that I will engage in at least one project to demonstrate my belief in interracialism and to challenge a pattern of segregation and discrimination;

"that I will give some help, in personal participation or by contributions, to at least one organization of my fellow Americans committed to the idea of brotherhood;

"that in all that I do I will remain nonviolent and act in a spirit of good will, recognizing that men must be converted to brotherhood, not browbeaten into it."

Suggestions for action include finding out the policy of theaters and restaurants and trying to change discriminatory policies; trying to change the pattern of newspapers which indicate the racial background of lawbreakers who are members of minority groups; finding out what the employment possibilities are for members of minority groups; and influencing one's church especially, if it does not accept all men as equal sons of God.

FOR members do this sort of thing all the year around, but this is an opportunity not only to do it yourself but to get others outside, as well as inside, of the FOR to work for brotherhood during a time when many people are particularly aware of the need. Write for full information and suggestions to George Houser, 21 Audubon Avenue, New York 32, New York.

Resignation from Reserves Refused

In response to a letter from First Lieutenant Walter E. Olson of Berkeley, California, submitting his resignation from his commission in the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Adjutant General of the Army replied that he regretted he could not "furnish a favorable reply. The present Department of the Army policy," the letter said, "provides for the acceptance of resignations only in cases wherein extreme compassionate reasons exist."

COs on Trial, Here and Abroad

Donald Fisk of Seattle, Washington, has been arrested for refusal to register and released on bond. No date has been set for trial.

Robert Hess, a student at Manchester College in Indiana, is free on bail awaiting trial for refusing to carry a draft card. He registered and received a 4-E classification, but later returned his draft card.

Arthur Morgan II, of Yellow Springs, Ohio, was registered "automatically" by the draft board clerk after he had been arrested for nonregistration.

Donald Hawkinson, a student at Augustana Seminary in Rock Island, Illinois, was arrested for refusal to register and pled guilty on March 7, later being released on bond pending investigation of the case by a probation officer. No further action has been taken, so far as is known.

Carl Kime, a nonregistrant who was automatically registered by the United States Attorney, was arrested on January 6 for refusal to carry a draft card. In October he was tried and found guilty, and is now awaiting sentence.

Robert Michener's conviction for refusing to register was upheld by the U.S. 10th Circuit Court of Appeals in Denver on October 30. He had been sentenced in Wichita, Kansas, to a year and a day.

Dr. Raleigh Pickard, FOR member from Nashville, Tennessee, studying at the University of Berkeley to go as a medical missionary to Korea, refused to register for the doctors' draft. He is married and has one child, with another on the way.

Israeli courts have twice acquitted girls who claimed to be COs, who were charged with perjury and evasion of military service. It was charged that though they had sworn they were COs for religious reasons, they were later observed violating Orthodox Jewish Sabbath laws. At both hearings, the courts held that a person can be genuinely religious by observing the spirit rather than the letter of religious laws.

New Zealand had 60 applications for CO status in the first six months of its peacetime draft, which ended June 30. Total registration for that period was 7,600, but is considered well below the number expected to register. Twenty-four of the CO applications had been heard, and all allowed except one, which was postponed.

National Council of Churches Formed

The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America came into being at 11 a.m. on November 29 as a single cooperative agency in which 29 denominations, represented in eight major interdenominational agencies, have joined "to advance the Christian cause at home and abroad." Succeeding the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the new organization includes such groups as the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, the Home Missions Council, the Missionary Education Movement, the United Council of Church Women, and others. The Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Sherrill was elected president and Samuel McCrea Cavert, general secretary of the Federal Council for 29 years, was elected general secretary.

Jottings

Henry Noel, 28-year-old Harvard graduate, who renounced his American passport for world citizenship in 1946, one year before Garry Davis, returned to the United States in November. However, he has no intention of reapplying for citizenship in the United States.

* * *

The faculty of Swarthmore College, in Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, has adopted a resolution opposing any policy of requiring faculty members to sign a loyalty oath. It called such oaths a "threat to the principle of academic freedom."

* * *

John Stevenson, FOR member of Tracy, California, has refused to sign the California loyalty oath and was fired from his job teaching in public school. He adds as an ironical note that he is interviewing applicants for his job, at the request of the school board.

* * *

The War Resisters League has installed as its new Executive Secretary Sidney Aberman of New York. He spent two and a half years in CPS, and since 1946 has been an educational director for cooperatives in the east.

* * *

St. George's Protestant Episcopal Church in New York on November 12 had three prominent ministers present the three positions of the church as outlined at the Amsterdam meeting of the World Council of Churches. FOR member the Rt. Rev. W. Appleton Lawrence took the pacifist position.

Maryland voters in a November referendum approved the Ober anti-subversive law under which Dr. Miriam Brailey, Doris Shamleffer and Elizabeth Haas, FOR members and Quakers, lost their jobs a few months ago for refusing to take the loyalty oath.

* * *

The Second Baptist Church of St. Louis, whose ministers, Leon R. Robison and Bruce G. McGraw, are FOR members, includes in the newspaper notice of its weekly sermon subject the sentence "This church works to promote individual and international peace."

* * *

The Society for Social Responsibility in Science reports that the bill to draft doctors and dentists, passed a few months ago, was at one time intended to include the drafting of all personnel in "professional, technical, scientific and specialist categories."

* * *

William Evans, 26, of Durham, North Carolina, deliberately approached three policemen there asking them to sign the Stockholm Peace Petition, in order to test a judge's order that those circulating the petition be arrested as vagrants. Recorder's Court Judge A. R. Wilson, in directing police to take such action, had observed that persons having nothing better to do in the present emergency than to circulate the Stockholm petition should be working on the roads. Evans described himself as an "ardent pacifist."

Letters

Rebuttal

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Since Prof. Hartmann, in his side of the article "Does Sociology Contradict Pacifism" had the opportunity of working from my article, I would like to have a similar opportunity of examining his statements very briefly.

First, I was somewhat disconcerted to see the twin articles titled as they were. My major thesis, despite the article's sub-title "Definitely Yes!", and despite Prof. Hartmann's statement that I implied that sociology is "anti-pacifist in nature," was only that scientific sociologists cannot, in their role as sociologists, be committed to any program of social action. As part of this conviction, I did *not*, as Prof. Hartmann states, ask to have my reserve commission reinstated. I asked only that the commission be considered "lapsed." Thus, I have committed myself neither to pacifism nor to war at the present time.

I was also disconcerted to see the level on which Prof. Hartmann apparently wants to conduct the discussion—thus, he covertly explains that I am an example of "neurological deterioration." This, I would say, is merely Dr. Hartmann's value judgment—if he were an "anti-pacifist," undoubtedly he would use the same invective to describe pacifists, since his judgments are apparently reflections of his personal commitment and not his scientific impartiality. His article is replete with other value judgments in which he says that certain contemporary mores are "wrong." Now, I do not wish to deny Dr. Hartmann and others the privilege of commitment—life would be worthless without such a privilege. But these commitments are hardly a "fruitful source of hypotheses" only. Dr. Hartmann states that pacifism supplies such hypotheses, but he fails to add that a worthy scientist never commits himself to supporting hypotheses in advance of empirical evidence that they are facts of nature. For example, I did not state that we "should" go to war merely because our nation is at war—I said only that war is sometimes the only "solution" given particular historical circumstances and given *certain value systems* (and I was talking about our values at that moment).

I might add that as a citizen (not a sociologist) I am committed to the same reconciliation as is Dr. Hartmann. But from what I have learned of social realities, and from what I know about past history impelling us to actions we may deplore idealistically, I feel at the moment that the absolute pacifist way is not a realistic approach to the problem. Nevertheless, I think I am closely akin to Dr. Hartmann in his aspirations. But I doubt that he feels the same, since, according to his article, he thinks that my position is "to some extent a form of regression to a more primitive level of conduct" whereas his—the lucky guy—represents "an ascent to higher ground."

THOMAS FORD HOULT
Indianapolis, Indiana

On the Other Hand

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Professor Hoult's article in the October issue of FELLOWSHIP illustrates what I regard as a widespread tendency to misuse the words *science* and *scientific*. The pure biological and physical sciences have made great contributions to our personal health, comfort and convenience through their practical application in medicine, sanitation and engineering. This has resulted in a great deal of glamour and prestige becoming attached to science and in scientists coming to be regarded as the acme of intellectual attainment in our present-day western civilization. Indeed the professional people in a great many fields—psychology, economics, sociology, politics and religion —have sought to appropriate the prestige of science for themselves by characterizing their own fields of study as being scientific.

As a chemist, I believe that the *spirit of scientific inquiry* is an attainment greatly to be desired and certainly very useful in any field of intellectual endeavor, unless it be the fine arts. But I maintain this does not mean those having this spirit of inquiry will necessarily be possessors of scientific *fact* (at least in the generally accepted sense of the word). I submit that the individual's answer to any controversial question—whether it be in the emotionally charged field of human relationships or in the physical sciences—will, in the final analysis, depend upon his own personal *philosophy*. In his paper, Professor Hoult said in part, "They are the reasons why sociologists . . . feel that the pacifist position is unrealistic for those who are not committed *a priori* to a series of half-truths, the deficiencies of which are glaringly evident in the light of science." This, I believe, is a foolish and naive attempt to fortify the logic of his own revised philosophical viewpoint by purporting it to be that of science.

I am further moved to inquire: If sociology does contradict pacifism, so what? Where does God's will fit into Prof. Hoult's scheme of things, or does it? And are pacifists to be transformed, or conformed to this world?

CECIL R. SMITH, JR.
Denver, Colorado

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

In saying that in the interesting exchange between Professors Hoult and Hartmann in October FELLOWSHIP on Sociology and Pacifism Professor Hoult came off a poor second best, I would not impugn either his sincerity or his scholarship. He has merely given undue emphasis to certain truths which sociologists have discovered about human behavior but in doing so has left out the profound social contribution made by the nonconformists throughout the ages. Who can say positively how much further behind we might be had Aristotle not been exiled, Socrates and Jesus not put to death, had Buddha conformed to the mores of his class, Pasteur believed that head-on opposition was sociologically a mistake? If we take a list of the men whom the human race has finally approved as its great teachers and leaders the percentage of head-on challengers is unbelievably high.

Professor Hoult's reference to historical realities as a justification for using authoritarianism and violence to deal with authoritarianism and violence is particularly unconvincing. The historical fact most pertinent at the moment is that protection by force has become an anachronism in the modern world. Specifically, a third world war with atom bombs as the weapon would destroy not merely Russia's culture and civilization, but our own and perhaps that of the

whole world. Of the magnitude of the risk involved in war today there is no one who doubts. It comes then to a choice between two calculated risks. There is the risk, on the one hand, that our reliance on force, building up armaments, fortifying bases near Russia, rearming Western Europe, and all the rest of our policy based on the idea that we can scare Russia into behaving as we think she should, may result in an armed clash. The history of preparedness as a means of avoiding war does not lend much comfort to the advocates of Professor Hoult's point of view. There is the risk on the other hand that if we really approached the Russian leaders in the spirit of understanding and realization of their background, the fears engendered in them by the invasion of Russia by the Western powers early in their revolution, the betrayal at Munich, our outright hostility and threatening gestures, and acknowledged with humility our own errors and sincerely asked for a new approach on both sides, our conduct might be interpreted as weakness. There is the risk that if we turned over now all our atomic weapons to the United Nations and gave reality and not lip service to disarmament, we might be attacked.

If the approach that we may feel sure that Jesus would make to the Russians is a more risky one than that of our big brass, I should still prefer to take that risk than the other. Granted that no one can say with assurance, I personally believe that the course we are pursuing is the one that involves the greater risk. That is a debatable question, involving psychological and economic as well as sociological questions. The somewhat dogmatic conclusion which Professor Hoult draws, however, from an oversimplification of certain sociological hypotheses is scarcely warranted by all that we know about history and psychology and social relations.

If Professor Hoult is right then those educators in Germany who went along with Hitler were right. I believe that they were wrong.

ROYAL WILBUR FRANCE
Winter Park, Florida

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

. . . Mr. Hoult claims that the broader knowledge he has obtained through the study of sociology has led him to desert pacifism. Although his knowledge may be broader it is not yet broad enough to include the peripheral aspects described by Thomas Sancton in his excellent article in the same issue. One of these peripheral aspects is the uncontested fact that there exist some individuals who are pushed by whatever inner compulsions to denounce the retrogressive act of war. These people are willing to expose the mores of a military culture even to the extent of refusing to support that culture with tax payments, regardless of whether any strengthening of peaceful traits result or even, as Mr. Hoult suggests, if their actions result in strengthening the military character of the society. I wonder what is Mr. Hoult's sociological explanation of this peripheral fact?

Mr. Hoult pleads for recognition of realities . . . one of which is "that there are certain political-economic systems of power in the world which would destroy our tradition of freedom if they could, by force of arms if necessary." I assume he points to the Communist systems. However, the Communist system has not yet tampered with my tradition of freedom. But the McCarran act and the spate of loyalty oaths and the threat of UMT do tamper with my freedom. These regulations have force of arms in back of them but it would be stupid and ineffective for me to fight them by shooting at them. My only hope is to go on voicing my disapproval of such threats to free-

dom, having faith that in the long, long run no one or no groups will have to use force.

"Pacifist truths," thinks Mr. Hoult, "are 'half' because they are not usually related to the total scheme of things. The pacifist . . . is inclined to search out evidence which supports his position and to ignore or reject all the rest." On the contrary, the pacifist knows very well that the total scheme of things allows little space now for pacifists. Despite this, the pacifist is willing to be ignored and rejected, though always hoping for the opposite, because his personal interpretation of the world situation allows no other course. It is this individual personal choice and acceptance of his relationship to the total scheme of things which compels the pacifist to act and think as he does. . . .

ORLENE W. MURAD
New Brunswick, New Jersey

ADVERTISEMENTS

PACIFIST ACCOUNTANT: experienced systems, budgets, taxes, insurance; C.P.A.; background physical and social sciences. Interested comptrollership or any other position, business or institutional, wherever efficiency is primarily a means to increase public service. Can sever present connections on reasonable notice; has family of four. Will reply promptly; write Box G, Fellowship.

Few sites remaining in non-profit hillside neighborhood developed by group of cooperating owner-builders near Los Angeles-Pasadena Freeway. Easy access, city and mountain views, commonly owned park, sun all day. Write or call Tom and Isabel Miller, 4567 Starling Way, Los Angeles 65, California. Phone CA 2-0746.

Good Conference!

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

I am a student at Northwestern University and a novice in the FOR circle. I saw the light just a short time prior to the national conference—largely through Clarence Jordan while at Green Lake, Wisconsin—and it was at the Evanston Conference that my nebulous ideas and beliefs began to take the form of a cohesive, well-grounded religious and pacific hypothesis of conviction. I will be forever indebted to that conference for getting my values straightened out, and its far-reaching significance will remain uppermost in my mind.

DEAN PEERMAN
Evanston, Illinois

Japan in Transition

By a member of the Japanese parliament

What is happening in Japan? How do the Japanese feel about the Occupation? Is the country likely to become Communist?

After you have read it yourself, order copies of this for wide distribution to your friends, libraries, ministers.

REPRINTED FROM
NOVEMBER FELLOWSHIP

5c each
35 for $1.00

FELLOWSHIP PUBLICATIONS

FOR Field Secretaries

Midwest: Albert Watson, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Ill.; *Far West:* Orval Etter, 1941 Oregon Street, Berkeley 3, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, Room 115, 213 S. Broadway, Los Angeles 12, Cal.; *Middle Atlantic:* Charles Walker, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa.

HOW TO WIN PACIFISTS . .

Inexpensive leaflets and pamphlets are the most effective means we have for getting the pacifist case before nonpacifists. Brief, hard-hitting, easy-to-read and easy-to-buy, they're effective and easy to distribute, but they have to BE distributed. That's why

LEAFLETS

Pacifism and the F.O.R.

CHALLENGE TO PACIFISM (Muste)	.05
*THE CONSCIENTIOUS COMBATANT (Hassler)	Free
HENRY HITT CRANE ON THE F.O.R.	Free
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE	Free
THAT'S WHERE THE MONEY GOES	Free
YOU ASKED ABOUT F.O.R.	Free
IS PEACE A BAD WORD? (new)	.75 per 100
IS THERE A LESSER EVIL? (new)	.75 per 100
JOIN THE F.O.R. NOW	Free
E. STANLEY JONES SAYS	Free
NONVIOLENT DIRECT ACTION AGAINST PREJUDICE	Free
PACIFISM AND THE HUMAN SPIRIT (Hassler)	Free
*THE ALTERNATIVE REVOLUTION (Eby)	.05
*CALCULATED RISK (Hassler)	.05
*CHRISTIAN FAITH & AMERICAN SCENE (Rutenber)	.05

Peacetime Conscription

THE CASE AGAINST UMT	.05
GULLIBLE'S TRAVELS	.05
YOU'LL RAISE YOUR BOY TO BE A SOLDIER—OR ELSE!	.01
YOU PAYS YOUR MONEY AND YOU TAKES YOUR CHOICE	.05

Disarmament

BARUCH vs. VISHINSKY (new)	.05
THE INDISPENSABLE INGREDIENT OF PEACE (new)	.05
THE TWO-DAY WAR OF 1968	.05
*THE HIGH COST OF ARMS	.05
*TOTAL DISARMAMENT OR TOTAL WAR	.05

Others

*BOSSES OF BILLIONS (the Army Engineers)	.05
WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT	.05
I'M AN ILL-ADJUSTED VETERAN	.05
THE MEANING OF KOREA	.05
THE LATCHSTRING PICTURE	.01
NOSING OUT PREJUDICE	.05
*THE CHURCH, THE CHRISTIAN AND WAR	.05
*COMMUNISM & CIVIL LIBERTIES (Muste)	.05
*CORPORAL BENNY SPEAKS UP (Hassler)	.05

** Reprinted from Fellowship.*

YOUR CHOICE

5 of each leaflet — or — any 100 leaflets

$1.00

. . AND INFLUENCE POLICY

we're listing all these available leaflets and pamphlets now. They do no good on our shelves, but they can do loads of good in the mail to friends and acquaintances, on church reading tables, or handed out at a street meeting. Order some today.

PAMPHLETS

GANDHI AND THE H-BOMB (Muste)	$.15
GANDHI'S SIGNATURE (Lester)	.25
MEAT IN DUE SEASON (Mayer)	.15
KOREA: SPARK TO SET A WORLD AFIRE? (Muste)	.25
AMERICA, RUSSIA AND THE BOMB (Swomley)	.25
PACIFISM AND PERFECTIONISM (Muste)	.15
TRAINING (Lester)	.10
WE CHALLENGED JIM CROW (Houser, Rustin)	.10
MILITARISM IN EDUCATION (Swomley)	.25
CELLS FOR PEACE (Steere)	.10
BETWEEN TWO WORLDS (Templin)	.05
CRUMBLING BARRIERS (Rumbough)	.25
FROM WAR PILOT TO WORLD CITIZEN (Davis)	.25
15 MEDITATIONS ON PEACE	.25
NEW EVIDENCE OF THE MILITARIZATION OF AMERICA	.25
WHAT WOULD PACIFISTS DO ABOUT DICTATORS (Muste)	.10

YOUR CHOICE

1 copy of each pamphlet — or — any 10 pamphlets

$2.00

The Sources of Faith

Most of us probably don't go through the ceremony, any more, of making New Year's resolutions. But if our faith is to be a vital thing we must stop, sometimes, and re-think it, deepen it, strengthen it. This is a good time to do that; and these two books, one new and one reprinted by demand, will give valuable help in the process.

THE DAGGER AND THE CROSS

By Culbert G. Rutenber

A brilliant analysis of the basis of pacifism in Christianity. This is a book on which pacifist Christians of the "liberal" and "conservative" wings will disagree at many points, but all will be challenged to do some basic thinking.

Price $1.00

And once more

WITH THE MASTER

By Philippe Vernier

Translated by Edith Lovejoy Pierce

This classic book of meditations has been out of print for some time, but constant requests for it have convinced us it must be reprinted. You will want this book, if you do not know it yet, for your own devotions. If you do, you will be giving copies as gifts.

Price $1.50

FELLOWSHIP PUBLICATIONS

21 Audubon Avenue New York 32, N. Y.